UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/554,230	10/25/2005	Norbert Stampfl	AT 030026	7950

24737 7590 04/01/2008
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER	
HOANG, SON T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2165	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/01/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/554,230	STAMPFL, NORBERT	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	SON T. HOANG	2165	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *03* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 January 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *07 January 2008* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This communication is in response to the amendment filed on January 7, 2008.

Claims 1-14 have been amended.

Claims 15-20 have been added.

Abstract's objection is withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

2. **First**, Applicant's argument with respect to **independent claim 1**, regarding the fact that Kotani et al. (Pub. No. US 2002/0059215, filed on October 29, 2001; hereinafter Kotani) does not teach or suggest "*selecting an information source*" and "*receiving at least a part of the content supplied by the information source selected, which part contains metadata*".

The Examiner respectfully submits in particular in response to Applicant's argument. Accordingly, Kotani explicitly discloses the image search process checks the directory where search object data are stored to generate a result list of search object data ([0075]). The directory is checked / selected in order for the search process to initiate in step S801.

Next, Kotani discloses for each iterated search object in step S803, meta-data contained in that search object data is extracted in step S804 ([0075]). Note that meta-data extraction from a file has a well-known meaning of getting / receiving the meta-data within a file.

3. **Second**, Applicant's argument with respect to **independent claim 1**, regarding the fact that Kotani does not teach or suggest "*if the criteria are satisfied, processing the useful information*".

The Examiner respectfully submits in particular in response to Applicant's argument. Accordingly, Kotani discloses the step S806 wherein the extracted meta-data is compared with the search condition / criteria. If the result of the comparison is positive "YES", then the search object data is registered in a search result list to be displayed later on ([0079]). Since the term '*processing*' used in the claim is broad and indefinite, when the search object data is '*registered*' in the result list, it is well equivalent that the search object data is '*processed*' in the result list.

4. **Third**, Applicant's argument with respect to **independent claim 1**, regarding the fact that Kotani does not teach or suggest "*for as long as the at least one predefined criterion is not satisfied, generating a control signal and transmitting it to the information source to change the content supplied by the information source, and again receiving at least a part of the content supplied by the information source, which part contains the metadata, and analyzing the metadata in respect of the predefined criteria*".

The Examiner respectfully submits in particular in response to Applicant's argument. Accordingly, Kotani discloses the extracted meta-data is compared against the search criteria / condition. If the i-th search data object has a meta-data that doest not match with the search condition, the search process will move to the next search object data, i.e. '*i-th + 1*' in step S809. Note that the control

signal in this case is inherently the comparison result '*NO*' in step S806. The process will search the '*i-th + 1*" object data until all data objects in the search directory have been processed. Note that in Figure 8, the directory passively supplies the data objects since it does not actively provide images to the search engine but allows the images to be searched on and/or manipulated by the search engine.

Interpretation of Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation

During patent examination, the pending claims must be given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.' Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the Examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969).

Reference is made to MPEP 2144.01 - Implicit Disclosure

> "[I]n considering the disclosure of a reference, it is proper to take into account not only specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom." In re Preda, 401 F.2d 825, 826, 159 USPQ 342, 344 (CCPA 1968)

Subsequent to an analysis of the claims it was revealed that a number of limitations recited in the claims belong in the prior art and thus encompassed and/or implicitly disclosed in the reference (s) applied and cited. It is logical for the Examiner to focus on the limitations that are "crux of the invention" and not involve a lot of energy and time for the things that are not central to the invention, but peripheral. The Examiner is aware of the duties to address each and every element of claims, however, it is also important that a person prosecuting a

patent application before the Office or an stakeholders of patent granting process make effort to understand the level of one of ordinary skill in the (data processing) art or the level one of skilled in the (data processing) art, as encompassed by the applied and cited references. The administrative convenience derived from such a cooperation between the attorneys and Examiners benefits the Office as well the patentee.

In view of the above, the Examiner contends that all limitations as recited in the claims have been addressed in this Action.

For the above reasons, the Examiner believed that rejections of the last Office action were proper.

Hence, Applicant's arguments do not distinguish over the claimed invention over the prior art of record.

In light of the foregoing arguments, the 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 rejections are hereby sustained.

Abstract

5. The amended abstract is acceptable for examination purposes.

Specification

6. The Specification's objection is maintained by the Examiner. Evidently, at least "*Background of The Invention*", "*Brief Summary of the Invention*", and "*Detailed Description of The Invention*" sections are missing. Appropriate corrections are required.

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the Applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

(a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
(b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
(c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
(d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.
(e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
(f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
    (1) Field of the Invention.
    (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
(g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
(h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
(i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
(j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
(k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
(l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Claim Objections

7. **Claim 19** is objected to because of the following informalities: obscured citation of the limitation "*when the second audio data is different than the first audio data*" on line 11. Appropriate correction / clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. **Claims 17-18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding **claims 17-18,** each of the claims recites "*The system of claim 7*" whilst **claim 7** does not refer to any system. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

10. The following is a quotation of the appropriate Paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this Section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

11. **Claims 1, 6-7**, and **12-14**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kotani et al. (*Pub. No. US 2002/0059215, filed on October 29, 2001; herein after Kotani*).

Regarding **claim 1,** Kotani clearly shows and discloses a method for automatically searching at least one information source accessible through a data network for contents that are supplied by this information source and satisfy at least one predefined criterion, which contents comprise useful information and metadata that characterizes the useful

information, the information source changing the content supplied by it under the control of control signals (*Figure 8*), comprising:

selecting an information source (*Step S801 of Figure 8 shows the directory where search object data are stored is checked to generate a processing list of search object data*, [0075]),

receiving at least a part of the content supplied by the information source selected, which part contains the metadata (*Step S802 of Figure 8 shows the counter 'i' of the processing list is set to '1', e.g., starting with the first object data in the processing list. In step S803, still image data contained in a file of the i-th search object data in the processing list is mapped. In step S804, meta-data contained in the search object data is extracted*, [0075]);

analyzing the metadata in respect of the predefined criteria and (*The extracted meta-data is compared with the search condition. For example, it is checked if 'str2' matches the data value of the search keyword*, [0078]),

if the criteria are satisfied, processing the useful information received (*It is checked in step S806, if a description of meta-data that matches the search condition is found. If YES in step S806, the flow advances to step S807, and the 'i-th' search object data is registered in a search result list*, [0079]), and

for as long as the at least one predefined criterion is not satisfied, generating a control signal and transmitting it to the

information source to change the content supplied by the information source, and again receiving at least a part of the content supplied by the information source, which part contains the metadata, and analyzing the metadata in respect of the predefined criteria (*Figure 8 shows that at step S806, if the meta-data of 'i-th' search object data does not match with user's search condition, the process will skip to step S808 where it will determine if all search data objects have been processed or not, if not, the process will increase the value of 'i-th' by 1, e.g., process the next object data in the list and go through all the steps as described above*).

Regarding **claim 6**, Kotani further discloses the processing of the useful information includes the recording of this information on a data carrier (*Also, the data input / output unit 100 writes data such as images and the like in the memory card*, [0036]).

Regarding **claim 7**, Kotani clearly shows and discloses a search arrangement for automatically searching at least one information source accessible through a data network for contents that are supplied by this information source and satisfy at least one predefined criterion, which contents comprise useful information, and metadata that characterizes the useful information, the information source changing the content supplied by it under the control of a control signal (*Figures 1-3)*, which search arrangement comprising:

receiving means that are arranged to select a connection to an information source and to receive useful information and metadata from the information source selected (*Data input / output unit 100 reads data of images and the like sensed by a digital camera or memory card or PC card, USB*, [0036]);

analyzing means that are arranged to analyze the metadata received in respect of the at least one predefined criterion (*Control programs required for the processes shown in the flow charts of Figure 6 and subsequent figures are stored in the storage unit 102 or ROM 105*, [0037]) and, if the criterion is not satisfied, to generate and emit an activating signal that represents the non-satisfaction;

processing means that are arranged to process the useful information received;

control-signal generating means that are arranged to generate the control signal and transmit it to the information source to change the contents supplied by the information source, the control-signal generating means being so arranged that they can be activated by the analyzing means with the help of the activating signal (NE) (*Control programs required for the processes shown in the flow charts of Figure 6 and subsequent figures are stored in the storage unit 102 or ROM 105*, [0037]).

Regarding **claim 12**, Kotani further discloses input means are provided for the input of criteria for the contents and/or for the input of information-source addresses (*An input unit 101 is a device for inputting user's instructions and data, and includes a keyboard and pointing device*, [0036]).

Regarding **claim 13**, Kotani further discloses the processing means are connected to display means and/or audio reproduction means and/or means for recording useful information (*First display means for displaying information the represents the search object data in the form of a list. The second display means for extracting meta-data contained in the search object data designated by the designation means, and displaying the extracted meta-data*, [0009]-[0011]).

Regarding **claim 14**, Kotani further discloses an arrangement for processing useful information having a search arrangement as claimed in **claim 7** (*An input unit 101 is a device for inputting user's instructions and data, and includes a keyboard and pointing device*, [0036]).

12. **Claims 19-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rosenberg et al. (*Pat. No. US 7,321,923, filed on March 18, 2002; herein after Rosenberg*).

Regarding **claim 19**, Rosenberg clearly shows and discloses a method (*Figure 18*), including:

receiving both audio data and corresponding metadata indicative of the audio data from an information source, wherein the information source streams the audio data and the metadata (*Figure 18 shows in step 1808, device 202 receives a sound recording that is being broadcast by a music broadcaster (such as music broadcaster 102) and plays the sound recording for user 110. Following step 1808, device 202 determines the identity of the received sound recording (step 1810). In digital and analog audio broadcasting systems it is possible to transmit meta-data along with the sound recordings*, [Column 23, Lines 19-26]);

determining whether the metadata matches user specified criteria (*After step 1810 control passes to step 1820. In step 1820, device 202 determines whether the received sound recording is a "needed" sound recording. A "needed" sound recording is a sound recording that is not in the sound recording library 216 and that matches an active profile 219 or is listed in an active wanted lists 215*, [Column 23, Lines 34-43]);

reproducing the audio data when the metadata matches the user specified criteria (*If the sound recording is needed or user 110 has indicated a preference for the sound recording, device 202 adds the sound recording to the library 216. That is, in one embodiment, device 202 performs steps 1822 and 1824. In step*

1822, device 202 stores the sound recording in storage device 214, [Column 23, Lines 56-61]); and

transmitting a control signal to the information source when the metadata does not match the user specified criteria, wherein the information source streams second audio data and second corresponding metadata indicative o the second audio data in response to the control signal (*Figure 18 shows that in step 1820 and 1821, the process go back to step 1808 in which a new recording broadcast by music broadcaster is received. The process will carry out the steps of determine records matching listener's criteria over again*), when the second audio data is different that the first audio data (*Figure 4 illustrates the information contained in an exemplary playlist 218. As shown, playlist 218 contains a list of sound recording identifies. Each sound recording identifier uniquely identifies a sound recording*, [Column 12, Lines 1-4]).

Regarding **claim 20**, Rosenberg further discloses presenting a message when the available information sources have been searched without finding metadata that matches the user specified criteria (*The server 280 uses this information to create an update message. Preferably, in creating the update message, server 280 compares a list of "new" sound recordings (a "new" sound recording in one that was loaded on the server on or after the date when the wanted list was last updated) to the*

received profile information to determine whether any of the "new" sound recordings match the received profile information (step 2304). After performing the comparison, the server transmits one or more update messages to device 202 depending on whether any of the new sound recordings fit the channel profile, [Column 27, Lines 26-38]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

13. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

14. **Claims 2-4**, and **9-10**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotani et al. (*Pub. No. US 2002/0059215, filed on October 29, 2001; herein after Kotani*) in view of Anderson (*Pat. No. US 6,427,165, filed on November 18, 1998*).

Regarding **claim 2**, Kotani does not disclose the transmission of searching process to the information source is carried out for as long as the at least one predefined criterion is not satisfied.

Anderson discloses a determination is made whether an information source, a node on the network, satisfy the search criterion by containing the desired information, also known as 'hit'. If no information source is found, the network continues to be searched until a

predetermined condition is met, e.g., a time-out period has passed or until a site containing the desired information is found ([Column 4, Lines 32-39]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Anderson with the teachings of Kotani for the purpose of searching the network for the information based upon a predetermined criterion and locating the information on a node of the network where the information is stored ([Column 1, Line 65 → Column 2, Line 6] of Anderson).

Regarding **claims 3**, and **9**, Anderson further discloses the abort criterion being defined as failure to receive metadata from the information source selected at the time within a predefined period of time (*If no information source is found, the network continues to be searched until a time-out period has passed*, [Column 4, Lines 32-39]).

Regarding **claims 4**, and **10**, Anderson further discloses selection of another information source other than the information source that was selected when the abort criterion was met (*If the connection rate has such a low value that the download time for a given size of information file is too great, then time will not be wasted in attempting to download the information and an alternative node containing the desired information may be located*, [Column 5, Lines 4-11]).

15. **Claims 5**, and **11**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotani et al. (*Pub. No. US 2002/0059215, filed on October 29, 2001; herein after Kotani*) in view of Anderson (*Pat. No. US 6,427,165, filed on November 18, 1998*) and further in view of Gawande et al. (*Pat. No. US 6,829,338; filed on October 2, 2002; hereinafter Gawande*).

Regarding **claims 5**, and **11**, Kotani, as modified by Anderson, does not disclose after the last available information source has been selected and an abortion criterion was met, discontinuation of the search on information source is carried out for a predefined period of time and then continue again.

Gawande discloses most traffic sources have a timeout mechanism in which, after a fixed period, a query with no response is either resent to the server or to another server, or is abandoned. Under server overload, the server throughput drops and the query response time is also delayed, resulting in time-outs, retrials or abandonment of queries at the traffic source ([Column 1, Lines 56-62]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Gawande with the teachings of Kotani, as modified by Anderson, for the purpose of mitigating the effect of overloads of a server in a network by using timeout mechanism ([Column 1, Lines 50-51] of Gawande).

16. **Claim 8** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotani et al. (*Pub. No. US 2002/0059215, filed on October 29, 2001; herein after Kotani*) in view of Ueda et al. (*Pub. No. US 2002/0003840; published on January 10, 2002; hereinafter Ueda*).

Regarding **claim 8**, Kotani does not disclose the abort condition is defined as repeated reception of the same metadata from the same information source and in that, if this abort criterion is met, the analysis of the metadata received from the selected information source is terminated.

Ueda discloses the repetition terminating condition may be a compound condition, such as error-free decoding or a limit number of repetitions or reception of an embedded stream header ([0075] and Figure 1).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the teachings of Ueda with the teachings of Kotani for the purpose of analyzing the basis of the stream header to detect for errors in the decoding process ([0014] of Ueda).

17. **Claims 15-18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kotani et al. (*Pub. No. US 2002/0059215, filed on October 29, 2001; herein after Kotani*) in view of Rosenberg et al. (*Pat. No. US 7,321,923, filed on March 18, 2002; herein after Rosenberg*).

Regarding **claim 15**, Kotani does not disclose the limitation of this instant claim.

Rosenberg discloses the information source streams the received content (*Receiver 210 can be any device that can receive a data stream. For example, it can be any one or a combination of the following: a radio frequency (RF) receiver for receiving data streams broadcast by radio waves, a cable-tv receiver for receiving signals transmitted through an analog or digital cable-tv system, a satellite receiver for receiving signals transmitted by satellite, a network receiver for receiving data streams transmitted through a network (e.g., the Internet), etc.*, [Column 5, Lines 23-35]).

It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Rosenberg with the teachings of Kotani for the purpose creating a personalized Internet or radio playlist to provide listeners with more controls over songs/records that fit their profiles ([Abstract] of Rosenberg).

Regarding **claim 16**, Rosenberg further discloses the information source includes a plurality of contents that are organized in the form of playlists (*music broadcaster 102 has three playlists 112, 114, and 116. Each playlist is associated with one of the stations A, B, and C*, [Column 4, Lines 15-19]).

Regarding **claim 17**, Rosenberg further discloses the information source includes an Internet music server (*Additionally, broadcaster 102 may employ many networks and/or systems to broadcast music to*

listeners 110. Such networks/systems include: satellite networks, cable television networks, the Internet, conventional radio towers, and other like networks and systems, [Column 4, Lines 9-14]).

Regarding **claim 18**, Rosenberg further discloses the receiving means receives multiple different streaming content that is concurrently supplied by the information source (*music broadcaster 102 has three playlists 112, 114, and 116. Each playlist is associated with one of the stations A, B, and C*, [Column 4, Lines 15-19]).

Conclusion

18. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Son T. Hoang whose telephone number is (571) 270-1752. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday (7:00 AM – 4:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Christian Chace can be reached on (571) 272-4190. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S.H./
Son T. Hoang
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2165
March 27, 2008

/Christian P. Chace/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2169